

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NEIL SURESH CHANDRAN,

Defendant.

4:22CR3077

ORDER

Defendant Chandran has moved to continue the deadline to appeal the District Judge's memorandum and orders (Filing Nos. 280 and 281). Such orders relate to Chandran's argument that seized assets should be returned to him. Chandran has previously indicated he requests this property be returned so he can retain counsel. Chandran's pending motions (Filing Nos. 290 and 291) are unopposed. Based on the showing set forth in the motion and pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(4), the court finds good cause has been shown and the motion should be granted, which will extend the time for Chandran to file a notice of appeal for a period of 30 days from the expiration of the time otherwise prescribed by Fed. R. App. P. 4(b). Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

- 1) Defendant Chandran's motion to continue, (Filing No. 290), is moot.
- 2) Defendant Chandran's amended motion to continue, (Filing No. 291), is granted.
- 3) Any appeal of the District Judge's Memorandum & Orders at Filing Nos. 280 and 281 shall be filed on or before June 16, 2025.
- 4) The Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the motion to continue outweigh the interests of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial, and the additional time arising as a result of the granting of the motion, the time between today's date and June 16, 2025 shall be deemed excludable time in any computation of time under the requirements of the Speedy Trial Act, because although counsel have been duly diligent, additional time is needed to determine the necessity of filing an appeal regarding the aforementioned orders and to adequately prepare this case for trial and failing to grant additional time might result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1) & (h)(7). Failing to timely object to this order as provided under this court's local rules will be deemed a waiver of any right to later claim the time should not have been excluded under the Speedy Trial Act.

Dated this 15th day of May, 2025.

BY THE COURT:
s/ Jacqueline M. DeLuca
United States Magistrate Judge